

## **REMARKS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.

### **RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action, on page 5, in the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner states that: "Applicant argues that Bronshvatch's reference does not include a spring portion." To the contrary, the Applicant's argument, in part, is based on the fact that Bronshvatch does include a spring portion and that independent claims 1, 8, 9 and 18 do not include a spring portion and patentably distinguish over Bronshvatch.

The Applicant's respectfully request that the finality of the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2005 be withdrawn so that the response filed on September 6, 2005 and the present response be considered.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bronshvatch et al. (U.S. 5,528,434) (hereinafter "Bronshvatch").

Bronshvatch discloses a disc clamp with an integrated stiffener for hard disc drives. The disc clamp 46 includes a central mounting portion that extends from the center of the disc clamp to a first radius 56. This central mounting portion 54 also includes a plurality of screw holes 58 equally spaced about a circle having a second radius 60 that is less than the first radius 56. The central mounting portion 54 also has a central opening 62. The central mounting portion 54 of the disc clamp 46 is bent downward from the center forming an obtuse conical shape. This conical central mounting portion will be deformed to a flat configuration upon assembly. The disc clamp 46 also includes a stiffening bend 64 immediately outside and defining the extent of the central mounting portion 54. This stiffening bend 64 is actually a compound bend made up of a first bend 66 in the upward direction and a second bend 68 in the downward direction. The configuration of the two simple bends 66, 68 that make up the stiffening bend 64 are selected, along with the material thickness, such that the stiffening bend 64 forms a portion of the disc

clamp 46 that is effectively non-bendable under the intended clamping force. Bronshvatch, 5:34 – 5:59.

Immediately outside the radius of the stiffening bend 64 is a spring portion 70 of the disc clamp 46, which is limited radially by a first contact-forming bend 72 again in the downward direction. The amount of bend to bring the plane of the spring portion 70 into parallel with the conical central mounting portion 54, although this parallel relationship is not mandatory. A second contact-forming bend 74 in the upward direction defines a circular contact surface 76 closely adjacent the outer extreme of the disc clamp 46, which is the sole contact between the disc clamp 46 and the uppermost disc in the complete assembly. Bronshvatch, 5:66 – 6:13.

#### **Claims 1-7**

Claim 1 recites: "...a pressing portion formed along an outer circumference of the disk clamp at an edge portion, to press an upper surface of the disk in a vertical direction; a stress distribution portion formed inside the pressing portion and having a profile with a curved shape bulged upward to distribute stress applied to the disk..." In contrast to claim 1, Bronshvatch discloses a stress distribution portion that includes a stiffening bend 64, including first bend 66 and second bend 68 and a spring portion 70. In Bronshvatch, stresses are absorbed by the spring portion 70. In claim 1, a stress distribution portion formed inside the pressing portion and having a profile with a curved shape bulged upward distributes stress applied to the disk. The structures of the disc clamp recited in claim 1 and in Bronshvatch are essentially different in that the disc clamp recited in claim 1 does not include a spring portion.

In the Office Action, on page 5, in the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner states that "Applicant argues that Bronshvatch's reference does not include a spring portion." To the contrary, the Applicant's argument is based on the fact that Bronshvatch does include a spring portion and patentably distinguishes over Bronshvatch as such.

The Applicant's respectfully request that the finality of the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2005 be withdrawn so that the response filed on September 6, 2005 and the present response be considered.

Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### **Claim 8**

Claim 8 recites: "...a substantially S-shaped edge portion to press an upper surface of a disk in a vertical direction and distribute stress applied to the disk..." In contrast to claim 8, Bronshvatch discloses a stress distribution portion that includes a stiffening bend 64, including first bend 66 and second bend 68 and a spring portion 70. In Bronshvatch, stresses are absorbed by the spring portion 70. In claim 8, stresses are distributed by an S-shaped edge portion. The structures of the disk clamp recited in claim 8 and in Bronshvatch are essentially different in that the disk clamp recited in claim 8 does not include or rely on a spring portion to absorb stresses.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### **Claims 9-17**

Claim 9 recites: "...a substantially wave-shaped edge portion to press an upper surface of a disk in a vertical direction and distribute stress applied to the disk..." In contrast to claim 9, Bronshvatch discloses a stress distribution portion that includes a stiffening bend 64, including first bend 66 and second bend 68 and a spring portion 70. In Bronshvatch, stresses are absorbed by the spring portion 70. In claim 9, stresses are distributed by a wave-shaped edge portion. The structures of the disk clamp recited in claim 9 and in Bronshvatch are essentially different in that the disk clamp recited in claim 9 does not include or rely on a spring portion to absorb stresses.

Claims 10-17 are dependent on claim 9 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### **Claim 18**

Claim 18 recites: "...a stress distribution portion formed inside the pressing portion and having a profile with a curved shape bulged upward to form a dome portion to distribute stress applied to the disk..." In contrast to claim 18, Bronshvatch discloses a stress distribution portion that includes a stiffening bend 64, including first bend 66 and second bend 68 and a spring portion 70. In Bronshvatch, stresses are absorbed by the spring portion 70. In claim 18, stresses are distributed by a stress distribution portion formed inside of the pressing portion.

The structures of the disk clamp recited in claim 18 and in Bronshvatch are essentially different in that the disc clamp recited in claim 18 does not include a spring portion.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov 28, 2005

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501